

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 584

SP 004 478

AUTHOR Hopkins, Mark L.
TITLE A Follow-Up Study of Recent Graduates of the College,
of Education, University of Missouri--Columbia.
INSTITUTION Missouri Univ., Columbia. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE May 70
NOTE 62p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.20
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers, *Followup Studies, *Preservice
Education, *Teacher Attitudes, Teaching
IDENTIFIERS *University of Missouri Columbia

ABSTRACT

As part of an analysis and evaluation of the teacher training program in the College of Education, University of Missouri--Columbia, a questionnaire survey was conducted 1) to ascertain if in the opinion of recent graduates their preservice program gave them adequate preparation for teaching, 2) to assess attitudes toward each of 13 education courses, and 3) to assess attitudes toward teaching as a profession. A 100-item questionnaire was constructed, based on interviews with several instructors. Subjects (279) were selected by random sample from a list of 1969 College of Education graduates. Findings, based on 96 percent return of questionnaires, indicate that most of the recent graduates are relatively well satisfied with teaching as a profession. As a group, they feel they are being paid adequately and future plans include pursuing an advanced degree. Students in general felt good about their preparation to work in the classroom but expressed concern over lack of actual experience working with children. Most felt that courses with practical experience such as student teaching were of most benefit. More skills related to actual teaching and media usage were needed. Attitudes toward specific courses were hard to ascertain. (The questionnaire with item-by-item findings is included.) (JS)

ED0 45584

NOV 20 1970

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF RECENT GRADUATES OF THE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - COLUMBIA

Completed - May, 1970

by

THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE

Dr. Robert H. Reifschneider - Director

Mark L. Hopkins - Assistant
EPDA Institute

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

824700478

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction -----	1
Problem -----	1
Related Literature -----	2
Method -----	4
Results -----	7
Discussion -----	9
Summary -----	10
References -----	11
Table 1, Gen Info -----	12
Table 2, Job Satisfaction & Future Plans -----	13
Table 3, Salary & Additional Renumeration -----	15
Table 4, A102 -----	17
Table 5, D140 -----	19
Table 6, E140 -----	21
Table 7, D111 -----	23
Table 8, D121 -----	25
Table 9, D124 -----	27
Table 10, D128 -----	29
Table 11, E167 -----	31
Table 12, E198 -----	33
Table 13, E325 -----	35
Table 14, E368 -----	37
Table 15, D199 -----	39
Table 16, E199 -----	42
Table 17, General Feelings Concerning Training -----	45
Appendix A, Qualitative Comments -----	49
Appendix B, Contact & Follow Up Letters -----	50
Appendix C, Questionnaire -----	54

Hopkins

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF RECENT GRADUATES OF THE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - COLUMBIA

Mark L. Hopkins

University of Missouri

EPDA Institute

The past several years have produced many questions concerning current educational practices. One of the major ones has to do with the preparation and training of our teachers. What constitutes the ideal college program for the training of teachers is still unknown. Consequently, there is a great need for research to help judge the merits of various programs. If progress is to be made in evaluation of teacher training programs, it is essential that each institution make a thorough study of its program.

Problem

This study is one aspect of an analysis and evaluation of the teacher training program in the College of Education at the University of Missouri-Columbia. This analysis is in terms of the opinions of recent graduates of courses in professional education taken by these students, content presented in these courses, and attitudes toward their overall training to teach in elementary or secondary schools. In addition, information will be gathered concerning present job satisfaction and future plans regarding education as an area of vocational choice.

The specific objectives of the study are as follows:

- (1) To ascertain if in the opinion of recent graduates, their pre-service program gave them adequate preparation for teaching:
- (2) To assess attitudes toward the following courses,

- A102 Educational Psychology
- D140 School Organization and Administration For
Secondary Teachers
- D199 Student Teaching in The Secondary School
- D111 Teaching of English in Secondary School
- D121 Teaching of Social Studies in Secondary School
- D124 The Teaching of Science In The Secondary School
- D128 Teaching of Mathematics in The Secondary School
- E140 School Organization and Administration For
Elementary Teachers
- E199 Student Teaching in the Elementary School
- E167 Mathematics in The Elementary School
- E198 Science in the Elementary School
- E325 Teaching Reading in The Elementary School
- E368 Social Studies in The Elementary School

- (3) To assess attitudes toward teaching as a profession.

Due to the nature of the investigation, this study rests upon the following assumptions: (1) The sample of recent graduates participating in this study is representative of the population of graduates of the University of Missouri teacher training program; (2) The recent graduates can identify the content presented in their courses; and (3) The expressed opinions of recent graduates completing the questionnaire will be somewhat indicative of the adequacy of the program presently offered.

Related Literature

Criticisms of the preparatory programs of teachers is not new. Wattenberg (1961) labeled as "inadequate" and "poor" the programs presently being conducted in the area of teacher training. He further stated that

our nation must dedicate resources to the study of education on a scale equal to that it accepts for roads, health, and space flights if we are to meet the demands (Wattenburg, 1961).

Willis (1968) examined in depth the conflict between academicians and educators on the value of education courses. He stated the premise for courses in education as follows: Prior knowledge of the student is usable; transfer of learning due to similarity of situation; formulating guidelines to follow; and course instructors should apply the same techniques in teaching as he would want his students to apply in theirs. Blackman (1967) found in his research that having students rate their instructors and courses was a worthwhile method of evaluation. Smith (1966) in his article, "Methods Courses as Seen by Students" formulated a series of questions asking students to evaluate their education courses. He found that overall courses are valuable and that students felt they had received much information from their education courses.

Chase (1963) in his investigation found that most beginning teachers thought they were pretty well prepared for making plans and teaching in a classroom but expressed concern at the lack of preparation for such duties as keeping study halls and for evaluating students' backgrounds. Most expressed a need for more student teaching and wiser experiences in such things as contact with the community. Shawyer (1968), like Chase, found that students indicated more need in practical application and experience than was being given them. He also suggested that more emphasis in courses should be placed on actual teaching skills and media usage. Presently we are not using enough skilled and critical analysis of the student teacher. Perhaps a period of internship after graduation for teachers would be of value (Shawyer, 1968).

The review of related research and literature indicates that some attention has been given to examining preservice preparation for teachers. However, the findings indicate that the research is limited and inconclusive; consequently, further study is essential.

A common finding of several authorities was that more actual teaching experience was needed during the pre-service training period. Though preparation for planning and conduct of classes seemed adequate, enough problems came up outside of this area to merit additional time being spent in training to meet these problems.

In conclusion, it is apparent that most educators agree that something must be done to insure that prospective teachers receive adequate training. The research, however, gives little direct assistance to teacher training colleges in improving their programs.

Method

Information for this study has been secured by questionnaire replies received from recent graduates of the College of Education, University of Missouri - Columbia. These recent graduates were selected by random sample from a list of 1969 College of Education graduates.

The first step in the development of the questionnaire was to collect information from several instructors currently involved in the teacher training program at the University. Those interviewed were as follows: Dr. A. Sterl Artley, Dr. James Craigmile, Dr. Wayne Dumas, Dr. Roger Harting, Dr. Charles Koelling, Dr. J. Benjamin Leake, Dr. Robert Reifschneider, Dr. Robert Reys, and Dr. Carey Southall. Each of these instructors after being advised of the project were asked

what they would like to find out from Missouri's recent graduates. Their replies to this question became the heart of the questionnaire. It was as a result of the interviews that the specific courses to be checked were ascertained and the specific type of question to be included was decided upon.

This study is based upon the assumption that the attitudes of recent graduates should be somewhat indicative of the quality of program offered. Hence, the questionnaire was designed to obtain opinions regarding the recent graduate's ability to assume the responsibilities of teaching upon completion of the teacher education program.

In order to minimize any ambiguity and interpretation problems which might arise when participants completed the questionnaire, a selected group of last semester seniors from the College of Education were asked to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaires were administered to three groups of five each. Each student was given an opportunity to raise specific questions and indicate any misunderstandings encountered in completing the questionnaire. Several alterations were needed after the first administration, but no new questions were raised on administration 2 and 3. On the basis of this information, the final questionnaire was constructed.

The questionnaire, accompanied by a cover letter and a self-addressed stamped envelope, was mailed to 322 recent graduates. Twenty-three were returned for insufficient address which reduced the number of graduates assumed to be contacted to 299. Two follow-up letters were sent to those who did not respond. A total of 279 recent graduates returned questionnaires for a 93% participation. Nine additional questionnaires were received after the cutoff date to bring the total response to 96%.

Each of the items on the returned questionnaires were key punched so that the computer could be used to help with the final evaluation of the information. Several questions of necessity were "open ended" and thus had to be hand tabulated. The findings of this study are based on the responses of recent graduates to the different items on the questionnaire. By the nature of the items included on the questionnaire, not all 279 recent graduates responded to each item. The total number of responses is included at the top of each table.

RESULTS

The information resulting from this study seems to indicate that most of the recent graduates are relatively well satisfied with teaching as a profession. Their answers indicate that, as a group, they are being paid adequately and that future plans include pursuing an advanced degree.

General information concerning those returning questionnaires is shown in table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Of significance in table 1 is that over three times as many females as males were included in this study. Question 4 establishes the five areas of specialization examined as elementary, English, social studies, mathematics, and several areas within the science division.

Table 2 deals with job satisfaction and future plans of participants.

Insert Table 2 about here

74% indicate that their job is what they hoped to obtain. 75% intend to continue teaching with 77% teaching in their present position again next year.

Salary level and need for additional income are the subjects of table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

Only twenty two of those questioned indicated that they were working at a job in addition to their teaching position. Of those "moonlighting" only two who responded to the question were involved in work related to teaching.

Tables 4 through 16 contain recent graduate's evaluations of the level of proficiency or understanding they developed in various aspects of the courses listed.

Insert Tables 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15, & 16 about here

Participants in the study graded each aspect on an "A" through "F" scale. Of significance is the positive reaction to practical experience activities as is indicated by grades given to the various aspects examined in the student teaching courses.

Questions dealing with the participants general feelings concerning their training as a teacher are included in table 17.

Include Table 17 about here

DISCUSSION

Several similarities exist between the findings of this study and previous research. Students in general felt pretty good about their preparation to work in the classroom but expressed concern over lack of actual experience working with children. Most felt that courses with practical experience such as student teaching were of the most benefit. More skills related to actual teaching and media usage were needed. Evaluation of the specific courses was impossible to compare with previous studies due to the structure of the questions used in this evaluation.

A number of factors limit the conclusions that can be drawn from the information resulting from this study. Some of these factors are as follows: (1) That only first year teachers were included in the study; (2) Not all major areas of specialization were included; (3) The group polled contained a considerably higher percentage of females than the general population of College of Education graduates; and (4) The nature of the instrument used in the poll restricted possible responses and thus did not allow participants freedom to express themselves adequately. This is evidenced by the number of participants who wrote additional comments in the margin of the questionnaire.

SUMMARY

This study is one aspect of an analysis and evaluation of the teacher training program in the College of Education at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Related literature indicates that most educators agree something must be done to insure that prospective teachers receive adequate training. The research, however, gives little direct assistance to teacher training

colleges in improving their program.

After interviewing several instructors currently involved in the teacher training program, a questionnaire was constructed that contained items of interest to the instructors. The questionnaire was sent to recent graduates of the teacher training program, College of Education, University of Missouri-Columbia. The findings of this study are based on the responses to the different items on the questionnaire.

The information resulting from the questionnaire indicates that most of the recent graduates are relatively well satisfied with teaching as a profession. As a group, they feel they are being paid adequately and future plans include pursuing an advanced degree. Attitudes toward specific courses were hard to ascertain though comments included on several questionnaires indicated that more involvement in actual teaching and student related activities would be of value. This was also indicated by the consistently higher evaluations given the various learning activities related to student teaching.

References

- Blackman, A. F. Students rate their professors and courses.
Phi Delta Kappan, 1967, 48, 266-9.
- Chase, H. M. What do beginning teachers think of teacher
training programs? Ohio Schools, 1963, 41, 30-1.
- Shawyer, D. Professional education or apprenticeship?
Record, 1968, 70, 127-31.
- Smith, F. Methods courses as seen by students. Improving
College And University Teaching, 1966, 14, 120-21.
- Wattenberg, W. W. Objective evaluation of teacher training.
American Teachers Magazine, 1961, 46, 7-8.
- Willis, D. E. Learning and teaching in methods courses.
Journal Of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 39-46, 165-75.

TABLE 1

General Information Questions

Item No.	Item	(N=279)	Number	Percentage
1. Sex				
	MALE sex		65	23
	female		212	76.5
2. Marital status				
	single		126	45.5
	married		148	53
	widowed, separated or divorced		3	1
3. On what level are you teaching?				
	elementary		161	58
	secondary		108	39
	both		6	2
	college		3	1
4. What is your teaching area of specialization?				
	elementary		154	55
	biology		12	4
	chemistry		2	1
	English		29	10
	general science		5	2
	mathmatics		35	12.5
	social studies		27	10
	other		12	4

TABLE 2
Job Satisfaction And Future Plans

Item No.	Item	(N=279)	Number	Percentage
7.	What influenced you to accept your present teaching job?			
	desirable location		63	23
	salary offered		17	6
	liked people I interviewed		16	6
	all of the above		118	42
	husband works in community		36	7
	husband in college		14	5
	other		6	2
8.	Is your position the kind you hoped to obtain?			
	yes		206	74
	no		67	24
9.	If "no" state the primary reason it failed to meet your aspirations.			
	undesirable location		10	14.5
	salary too low		11	16
	too many preparations		7	10
	poor teaching conditions		17	25
	too many extra assignments		2	3
	other		22	31

TABLE 2 (Continued)

14. What is your reaction to teaching?

like it very much	127	46.5
well satisfied	59	22
satisfied	74	27
just tolerate it	10	4
dislike it	2	1

15. What are your plans as far as teaching is concerned?

intend to continue	199	75
plan to drop out	7	3
am undecided at present	30	11
plan to drop out for time being	29	11

16. Please indicate your plans for next year.

will teach again at present location	194	77
expect to go back to college	17	7
plan to enter another type work	18	7
plan not to work	17	7
will teach again at another location	5	2

5. Have you begun work on an advanced degree?

yes	51	18.5
no	221	80

6. If "no" do you plan to begin work on an advanced degree in the near future?

yes	124	52
no	25	11
not sure	76	35

TABLE 3

Salary Provided By Teaching Position
And Necessity For Additional Renumeration

Item No.	Item	(N=279)	Number	Percentage
10.	Please indicate your salary for full year.			
	range:			
	high		\$9300	
	low		\$4500	
	mean		\$6316	
11.	Do you have employment in addition to your teaching job?			
	yes		22	6
	no		257	93
12.	If yes, how many hours per week do you work other than teaching?			
	1 hr		1	4.5
	2 hr		1	4.5
	3 hr		4	18
	4 hr		4	18
	6 hr		2	9
	8 hr		1	4.5
	9 hr		6	27
	10 hr		2	9
	20 hr		1	4.5

TABLE 3 (Continued)

13. What type of work do you do
other than teaching?

store clerk	1	4.5
bowling instructor	1	4.5
bus driver	1	4.5
tax consultant	1	4.5
teach cake decorating	1	4.5
teach piano	1	4.5
shoe salesman	1	4.5
life insurance salesman	1	4.5
other responses not given	14	64

TABLE 4

In A102 Educational Psychology, What Level
Of Understanding Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=252)	Number	Percentage
17.	The concept of intelligence and measuring ability			
	A (5)		10	4
	B (4)		25	10
	C (3)		119	47
	D (2)		76	30
	F (1)		22	8
				Mean = 3.298
18.	How students are motivated			
	A (5)		13	5
	B (4)		46	18
	C (3)		106	42
	D (2)		67	26.5
	F (1)		21	8
				Mean = 3.146
19.	How students learn			
	A (5)		10	4
	B (4)		43	17
	C (3)		113	44.6
	D (2)		70	27.6
	F (1)		17	7
				Mean = 3.162

TABLE 4 (Continued)

20. Using statistics and measurement
in the classroom

A (5)	27	11
B (4)	71	28
C (3)	89	35
D (2)	50	20
F (1)	15	6

Mean = 2.821

TABLE 5

In D140, School Organization And Administration
For Secondary Teachers, What Level Of Understanding
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=124)	Number	Percentage
21.	The roles of federal, state, and local government agencies in education			
	A (5)		20	7
	B (4)		51	18
	C (3)		36	13
	D (2)		15	5
	F (1)		2	1
				Mean = 3.581
22.	Professional relationships and responsibilities of the classroom teacher			
	A (5)		33	27
	B (4)		48	39
	C (3)		32	26
	D (2)		8	6.5
	F (1)		2	2
				Mean = 3.829
23.	The teacher's responsibility outside assigned classroom duties			
	A (5)		24	19.5
	B (4)		39	32
	C (3)		42	34
	D (2)		16	13
	F (1)		2	2

TABLE 5 (Continued)

24. Developments in secondary education

A (5)	14	11
B (4)	38	32
C (3)	42	34
D (2)	16	13
F (1)	12	10

Mean = 3.213

TABLE 6

In B140 School Organization And Administration
For Elementary Teachers, What Level Of Understanding
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=146)	Number	Percentage
25.	The roles of federal, state, and local government agencies in education			
	A (5)		7	5
	B (4)		53	36
	C (3)		55	38
	D (2)		19	13
	F (1)		12	8
				Mean = 3.164
26.	The organization of schools for instructional purposes			
	A (5)		29	20
	B (4)		53	36
	C (3)		51	34
	D (2)		8	5
	F (1)		6	4
				Mean = 3.619

TABLE 6 (Continued)

27. Classroom management and control

A (5)	27	18
B (4)	45	31
C (3)	47	32
D (2)	20	13
F (1)	8	5

Mean = 3.429

28. Measurement and evaluation of pupil progress

A (5)	13	9
B (4)	56	39
C (3)	53	37
D (2)	14	10
F (1)	7	5

Mean = 3.378

29. Professional status, obligations and responsibilities of teachers

A (5)	35	24
B (4)	39	27
C (3)	51	35
D (2)	12	8
F (1)	6	4

Mean = 3.594

TABLE 7

In D111, Teaching Of English In
Secondary Schools, What Level Of Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=33)	Number	Percentage
30.	Preparing unit and daily lesson plans			
	A (5)		9	27
	B (4)		8	24
	C (3)		11	33
	D (2)		4	12
	F (1)		1	3
				Mean = 3.606
31.	Adjusting content to individual differences			
	A (5)		5	16
	B (4)		8	25
	C (3)		8	25
	D (2)		11	34
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 3.219
32.	Evaluation of student learning			
	A (5)		2	6
	B (4)		14	44
	C (3)		11	34
	D (2)		5	16
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 3.406

TABLE 7 (Continued)

33. Classroom management

A (5)	5	16
B (4)	14	44
C (3)	6	19
D (2)	5	16
F (1)	2	6

Mean = 3.469

34. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	1	3
B (4)	14	44
C (3)	10	31
D (2)	5	15.6
F (1)	2	6

Mean = 3.219

35. Adapting learning activities to English

A (5)	7	22
B (4)	10	31
C (3)	4	12.5
D (2)	11	34
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 3.406

TABLE 8

In D121, Teaching Of Social Studies
In Secondary Schools, What Level Of Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=33)	Number	Percentage
36.	Preparing unit and daily lesson plans			
	A (5)		6	18
	B (4)		12	36
	C (3)		8	24
	D (2)		4	12
	F (1)		3	9
				Mean = 3.424
37.	Adjusting content to individual differences			
	A (5)		4	12.5
	B (4)		5	15.6
	C (3)		12	37.5
	D (2)		7	22
	F (1)		4	12.5
				Mean = 2.938
38.	Evaluation of student learning			
	A (5)		3	9
	B (4)		6	19
	C (3)		15	47
	D (2)		6	19
	F (1)		2	6
				Mean = 3.063

TABLE 8 (Continued)

39. Classroom Management

A (5)	3	9
B (4)	5	15.6
C (3)	16	50
D (2)	5	15.6
F (1)	3	9

Mean = 3.000

40. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	6	19
B (4)	11	34
C (3)	7	22
D (2)	5	15.6
F (1)	3	9

Mean = 3.375

41. Adapting learning activities to social studies

A (5)	5	16
B (4)	8	26
C (3)	11	35
D (2)	4	13
F (1)	3	9.6

Mean = 3.258

TABLE 9

In D124, Teaching Of Science In
Secondary Schools, What Level Of Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=17)	Number	Percentage
42. Preparing unit and daily lesson plans				
	A (5)		4	23.5
	B (4)		2	12
	C (3)		4	23.5
	D (2)		4	23.5
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 3.000
43. Adjusting content to individual differences				
	A (5)		2	12
	B (4)		6	35
	C (3)		5	29
	D (2)		4	23.5
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 3.353
44. Evaluation of student learning				
	A (5)		1	6
	B (4)		8	47
	C (3)		4	23.5
	D (2)		3	17.6
	F (1)		1	6
				Mean = 3.294

TABLE 9 (Continued)

45. Classroom management

A (5)	1	6
B (4)	6	35
C (3)	5	29
D (2)	3	17.6
F (1)	2	12

Mean = 3.059

46. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	6	35
B (4)	4	23
C (3)	5	29
D (2)	2	12
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 3.824

47. Adapting Learning activities to science

A (5)	6	35
B (4)	7	41
C (3)	2	12
D (2)	2	12
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 4.000

TABLE 10

In D128, Teaching Of Math In Secondary
Schools, What Level Of Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=35)	Number	Percentage
48. Preparing unit and daily lesson plans				
	A (5)		2	6
	B (4)		7	20
	C (3)		15	43
	D (2)		7	20
	F (1)		4	11
				Mean = 2.886
49. Adjusting content to individual differences				
	A (5)		6	17
	B (4)		2	6
	C (3)		11	31
	D (2)		13	37
	F (1)		3	8.5
				Mean = 2.857
50. Evaluation of student learning				
	A (5)		0	0
	B (4)		12	34
	C (3)		7	20
	D (2)		10	28.5
	F (1)		6	17
				Mean = 2.714

TABLE 10 (Continued)

51. Classroom management

A (5)	3	8.5
B (4)	8	23
C (3)	5	14
D (2)	11	31
F (1)	8	23

Mean = 2.629

52. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	1	3
B (4)	10	28.5
C (3)	19	54
D (2)	0	0
F (1)	5	14

Mean = 3.057

53. Adapting learning activities to math

A (5)	0	0
B (4)	12	34
C (3)	11	31
D (2)	6	17
F (1)	6	17

Mean = 2.829

TABLE 11

In E167, Mathematics In The Elementary
School, What Level Of Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=146)	Number	Percentage
68.	Preparing unit and daily lesson plans			
	A (5)		15	10
	B (4)		31	21
	C (3)		47	32
	D (2)		37	25
	F (1)		16	11
				Mean = 2.945
69.	Adjusting content to individual differences			
	A (5)		12	8
	B (4)		31	21
	C (3)		56	38
	D (2)		37	25
	F (1)		11	7.5
				Mean = 2.979
70.	Evaluation of student learning			
	A (5)		10	7
	B (4)		31	21
	C (3)		64	44
	D (2)		32	22
	F (1)		9	6
				Mean = 3.007

TABLE 11 (Continued)

71. Classroom management

A (5)	10	7
B (4)	25	17
C (3)	58	40
D (2)	37	25.5
F (1)	15	10

Mean = 2.848

72. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	32	22
B (4)	58	40
C (3)	39	27
D (2)	13	9
F (1)	4	3

Mean = 3.692

73. Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area

A (5)	18	12
B (4)	51	35
C (3)	52	35.6
D (2)	20	13.6
F (1)	5	3

Mean = 3.390

TABLE 12

In E198, Teaching Science In The Elementary
School, What Level Of Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=78)	Number	Percentage
74.	Preparing unit and daily lesson plans			
	A (5)		19	24
	B (4)		28	36
	C (3)		22	28
	D (2)		9	11.5
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 3.731
75.	Adjusting content to individual differences			
	A (5)		13	17
	B (4)		22	28
	C (3)		31	39
	D (2)		10	13
	F (1)		2	2.5
				Mean = 3.436
76.	Evaluation of student learning			
	A (5)		11	14
	B (4)		24	32
	C (3)		27	35
	D (2)		10	13
	F (1)		5	6
				Mean = 3.346

TABLE 12 (Continued)

77. Classroom management

A (5)	14	18
B (4)	11	14
C (3)	40	53
D (2)	7	9
F (1)	5	6

Mean = 3.286

78. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	17	22
B (4)	35	46
C (3)	18	24
D (2)	6	8
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 3.829

79. Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area

A (5)	17	21
B (4)	28	35
C (3)	24	32
D (2)	8	10
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 3.756

TABLE 13

In E325, Teaching Reading In The
Elementary School, What Level Of Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=143)	Number	Percentage
80. Preparing unit and daily lesson plans				
	A (5)		20	14
	B (4)		37	26
	C (3)		53	37
	D (2)		19	13
	F (1)		14	10
				Mean = 3.210
81. Adjusting content to individual differences				
	A (5)		40	27
	B (4)		56	38
	C (3)		31	21
	D (2)		15	10
	F (1)		3	2
				Mean = 3.822
82. Evaluation of student learning				
	A (5)		19	13
	B (4)		66	45
	C (3)		45	31
	D (2)		11	7.5
	F (1)		5	3
				Mean = 3.568

TABLE 13 (Continued)

83. Classroom management

A (5)	19	13
B (4)	39	26.5
C (3)	60	41
D (2)	20	14
F (1)	9	6

Mean = 3.265

84. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	25	17
B (4)	54	37
C (3)	49	33
D (2)	15	10
F (1)	2	1

Mean = 3.586

85. Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area

A (5)	30	20
B (4)	56	38
C (3)	46	31
D (2)	11	7
F (1)	4	3

Mean = 3.660

TABLE 14

In E368, Social Studies In The
Elementary School, What Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=45)	Number	Percentage
86.	Preparing unit and daily lesson plans			
	A (5)		7	15.5
	B (4)		15	33
	C (3)		13	29
	D (2)		4	9
	F (1)		6	13
				Mean = 3.289
87.	Adjusting content to individual differences			
	A (5)		4	10
	B (4)		12	29
	C (3)		18	44
	D (2)		3	7
	F (1)		4	10
				Mean = 3.220
88.	Evaluation of student learning			
	A (5)		4	10
	B (4)		12	29
	C (3)		16	39
	D (2)		4	10
	F (1)		5	12
				Mean = 3.146

TABLE 14 (Continued)

89. Classroom management

A (5)	5	12
B (4)	8	19.5
C (3)	16	39
D (2)	7	17
F (1)	5	12

Mean = 3.024

90. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	9	22
B (4)	12	29
C (3)	14	34
D (2)	1	2
F (1)	5	12

Mean = 3.463

91. Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area

A (5)	4	10
B (4)	15	36.5
C (3)	17	41
D (2)	2	5
F (1)	3	7

Mean = 3.366

TABLE 15

In D199, Student Teaching In The
Secondary Schools, What Level Of Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=98)	Number	Percentage
54.	Understanding of requirements of, and obligations to, the school in which I was teaching.			
	A (5)		40	41
	B (4)		43	43
	C (3)		12	12
	D (2)		4	4
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 4.204
55.	Preparing unit and daily lesson plans			
	A (5)		42	43
	B (4)		27	27.5
	C (3)		24	24
	D (2)		5	5
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 4.082
56.	Adjusting content to individual differences			
	A (5)		22	22
	B (4)		41	42
	C (3)		21	21
	D (2)		14	14
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 3.724

TABLE 15 (Continued)

57. Evaluation of student learning

A (5)	23	23
B (4)	55	56
C (3)	16	16
D (2)	4	4
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 3.990

58. Classroom management

A (5)	24	24
B (4)	51	52
C (3)	17	17
D (2)	6	6
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 3.949

59. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	18	18
B (4)	40	41
C (3)	29	29.5
D (2)	11	11
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 3.663

TABLE 15 (Continued)

60. Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area

A (5)	24	25.5
B (4)	38	39
C (3)	20	20
D (2)	14	14
F (1)	1	1

Mean = 3.735

TABLE 16

In E199, Student Teaching In The Elementary
Schools, What Level Of Proficiency
Did You Develop In The Following:

Item No.	Item	(N=147)	Number	Percentage
61.	Understanding of requirements of, and obligations to, the school in which I was teaching			
	A (5)		77	52
	B (4)		45	31
	C (3)		19	13
	D (2)		6	4
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 4.313
62.	Preparing unit and daily lesson plans			
	A (5)		89	60
	B (4)		38	26
	C (3)		12	8
	D (2)		8	5
	F (1)		1	1
				Mean = 4.392
63.	Adjusting content to individual differences			
	A (5)		43	29
	B (4)		77	52
	C (3)		20	14
	D (2)		5	3
	F (1)		2	1
				Mean = 4.048

TABLE 16 (Continued)

64. Evaluation of student learning

A (5)	50	34
B (4)	63	43
C (3)	26	18
D (2)	7	5
F (1)	1	1

Mean = 4.048

65. Classroom management

A (5)	67	45
B (4)	48	32
C (3)	27	18
D (2)	6	4
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 4.189

66. Use of instructional materials and media

A (5)	54	37
B (4)	58	39
C (3)	25	17
D (2)	7	5
F (1)	3	2

Mean = 4.041

TABLE 16 (Continued)

67. Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area

A (5)	54	37
B (4)	67	46
C (3)	19	13
D (2)	6	4
F (1)	0	0

Mean = 4.158

TABLE 17

What Are Your General Feelings Concerning Your
Training As A Teacher In The Following Areas:

Item No.	Item	(N=258)	Number	Percentage
92.	Developed an understanding of how students learn			
	A (5)		17	7
	B (4)		116	46
	C (3)		95	37
	D (2)		23	9
	F (1)		3	1
				Mean = 3.476
93.	Developed and understanding of the teacher's role in the classroom			
	A (5)		63	24
	B (4)		131	51
	C (3)		52	20
	D (2)		12	5
	F (1)		0	0
				Mean = 3.950

TABLE 17 (Continued)

94. Developed an understanding of the school's administrative structure

A (5)	41	16
B (4)	96	37
C (3)	88	34
D (2)	27	10
F (1)	6	2

Mean = 3.539

95. Developed a knowledge of teacher's professional organizations

A (5)	34	13
B (4)	82	32
C (3)	103	40
D (2)	32	12
F (1)	7	3

Mean = 3.403

96. Developed the knowledge and skills to handle new innovative practices in education

A (5)	30	12
B (4)	126	49
C (3)	72	28
D (2)	23	9
F (1)	5	2

Mean = 3.598

TABLE 17 (Continued)

97. Developed the knowledge and skills
to be a good teacher

A (5)	50	20
B (4)	124	49
C (3)	55	21.5
D (2)	21	8
F (1)	5	2

Mean = 3.757

98. Developed an appreciation of Missouri's
teacher education program

A (5)	26	10
B (4)	74	29
C (3)	95	37
D (2)	47	18
F (1)	13	5

Mean = 3.208

Hopkins

APPENDIX A

Hopkins

FOLLOW UP STUDY QUALITATIVE COMMENTS

A number of unsolicited comments were written in the margin of the questionnaires sent to recent graduates of the College of Education, University of Missouri-Columbia. These comments were of a qualitative nature and have been copied below.

1. I'm a new teacher and have discovered to my dismay that the University has prepared me generally to be a good conversationalist about literature, a semi-organized teacher, and a sometimes dismayed professional. I was taught theory that cannot be practiced today in most schools. Some of it can be used in a limited manner but most was too vague.
2. After student teaching, I knew what to look for in my courses. This was too late, however, because I only had one semester left. It would be much better if the prospective teacher could have some experience like this early in his school career. The sophomore year would be great.
3. The two hour course in methods was not enough. There must be more time to cover all of the possibilities in the subject field.
4. I feel very frustrated with my education and know certainly that I need more. The only problem is that I may not be able to get more of an education and I feel that I should have been more adequately trained during those four years I spent there in Columbia.
5. Most of what I know about teaching I learned in student teaching or in my first year on the job.
6. It seems a shame that there are not requirements for a sophomore in the College of Education to have to observe sessions of regular classes. Too many students have to wait until they student teach to find they are dissatisfied.
7. My education courses seemed far removed from actual circumstances in the classroom.

Hopkins

8. Teacher education at MU proved very unsatisfactory. Student teaching was the most beneficial aspect of teacher education.
9. I feel my education was poor; Not at all preparing me.
10. I feel the course in use of instructional materials and media should be a requirement. I felt I was lacking in this area and I wished I had taken the course.
11. I think that student teaching is the most worthwhile education course offered by the university. If you could do your student teaching when you are a freshman or sophomore, maybe you could benefit more from the other education courses.
12. If I hadn't had an excellent student teaching supervisor I doubt I'd be teaching today--the need to revamp our teacher training program is urgent.
13. Courses do not prepare future teachers for actual classroom problems.
14. Practical application and experience in the classroom is where I feel I learned the most. I definitely think you should have this before your senior year. Education courses would mean so much more to one who has experienced actual classroom situations.
15. After one year's teaching experience, I am regretful to add that I feel the educational program at MU is pitifully poor. Though my grades in college indicated that I learned a good deal about teaching, in actual practice my college education was inadequate to the needs of good teaching.
16. My cooperating teacher was a first year teacher. That is not a good idea.
17. Missouri is 10 years out of date in its program. Missouri high schools are 20 years out of date. The improvements fostered at Mizzou are relative.

Hopkins

18. I never gave up hope, but with the exception of a few bright spots, I was very much disappointed with my education courses at the University.
19. I've had an excellent experience.
20. Idealistic situations can not compare with practical application. Missouri's educational program could be improved by using more classroom experience in classes other than student teaching.
21. We need less education courses and more actual classroom observations and practice. We also need training in how to handle discipline problems with the "non-motivated" students.
22. More experiences with children in a classroom situation should be provided before senior year.
23. Generally speaking--too much time was wasted in education classes at MU on lengthy speeches on philosophy, theory, and unusable generalities. In my opinion the undergraduate program would really prepare students for classroom teaching if they used more "active observation-participation" in real classrooms and guide observation so that it really relates to MU instruction. Individual methods classes and student teaching were the most valuable and really usable classes at the University. I hope something comes of this.
24. I feel as if my student teaching was the most beneficial part of my college career. Courses need re-evaluation.
25. I felt in many of my classes that I had not been prepared by the course for situations which arise in actuality and not in theory.
26. I do not feel that they gave me a practical, working knowledge of what to do in the classroom.
27. I would like to say that I feel the best courses are those which either give you actual experience with children or give you usable ideas.

Hopkins

APPENDIX B

Hopkins

University of Missouri - Columbia



111 Hill Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65201

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Office of Director of Educational Placement

Telephone
314 449 9674

March 9, 1970

Dear Alumnus,

The purpose of this letter is to enlist your help in a project currently being undertaken by the Educational Placement Office at the University of Missouri.

I am sure you are becoming more aware as the year progresses that keeping our educational programs relevant to today's changing times is one of the major problems facing us in American education. The Educational Placement Office as a part of the College of Education is concerned with the feelings and opinions you have concerning the quality of the teacher training program you completed last year.

I am aware that as a first year teacher your time is in great demand. With this in mind the enclosed survey is designed to take only about ten minutes to complete. You will find a self addressed, stamped envelope enclosed for your convenience. Your participation in the opinion survey will be greatly appreciated. Results will be instrumental in helping evaluate the current program and should provide valuable insight into what changes might be made to improve the program for future participants.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. The College of Education is anxious to produce the best teacher training program possible at the University of Missouri. Your assistance in this project is certainly appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Mark L. Hopkins".

Mark L. Hopkins
Placement Assistant

Hopkins

University of Missouri - Columbia



111 Hill Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65201

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Office of Director of Educational Placement

Telephone
314 449 9674

March 26, 1970

Dear Alumnus,

About three weeks ago you were invited to participate in an opinion survey designed to aid in the evaluation of the teacher training program at the University of Missouri. To date about 75% of the forms have been returned and we certainly would like to have 100% participation.

I realize you have many demands on your time, but I certainly would like to include the information you could provide in the final tally of information. I have taken the liberty of enclosing another questionnaire in case your first copy was misplaced.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. Your assistance in this project is certainly appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mark L. Hopkins".

Mark L. Hopkins
Placement Assistant

Hopkins

University of Missouri - Columbia



111 Hill Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65201

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Office of Director of Educational Placement

Telephone
314 440-9674

April 10, 1970

Dear Alumnus,

Two weeks ago you were sent a questionnaire from the Educational Placement Office at the University of Missouri concerning a study of the teacher training program presently functioning at the University. To date I have not received your reply.

It is vital that I receive this information in order for a valid study to be made. I realize you have many demands on your time, but I would appreciate receiving the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. I have taken the liberty of enclosing another questionnaire in case the first copy was misplaced.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mark L. Hopkins".

Mark L. Hopkins
Placement Assistant

Hopkins

APPENDIX C

University of Missouri

ID No. _____

College of Education

(1-4)

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

NOTE: If you are not teaching, please answer the questions in Section I only. If you are presently teaching, please answer those questions that apply to you in Sections II and III. On the space provided at the start of each question, put in the number of your response. Please ignore the numbers to the left of each question. These numbers are for computer purposes only.

SECTION I.

- (5) _____ SEX (8-12) PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PRESENT SALARY.
 1. Male
 2. Female
- (6) _____ MARITAL STATUS (13) PLEASE INDICATE WHY YOU CHOSE NOT TO TEACH THIS YEAR.
 1. Single
 2. Married
 3. Widowed, separated divorced
 1. No teaching position available where I live.
 2. Salary better than I could earn teaching
 3. Like present work better than teaching
 4. Family responsibilities
 5. Drafted
 6. Other, specify _____
- (7) _____ WHAT TYPE OF POSITION DO YOU PRESENTLY HAVE?
 1. Student pursuing higher degree
 2. Job in business
 3. Housewife
 4. In military service
 5. Other, specify _____

SECTION II.

- (5) _____ SEX (10) HAVE YOU BEGUN WORK ON AN ADVANCED DEGREE?
 1. Male
 2. Female
 1. Yes
 2. No
- (6) _____ MARITAL STATUS (11) IF "NO" DO YOU PLAN TO BEGIN WORK ON AN ADVANCED DEGREE IN THE NEAR FUTURE?
 1. Single
 2. Married
 3. Widowed, separated divorced
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Not sure at this time
- (7) _____ ON WHAT LEVEL ARE YOU TEACHING? (12) WHAT INFLUENCED YOU TO ACCEPT YOUR PRESENT TEACHING JOB?
 1. Elementary
 2. Secondary
 3. Both elementary and secondary
 4. College
 1. Desirable location
 2. Salary offered
 3. Liked people I interviewed
 4. All of the above
 5. Husband works in community
 6. Other, specify _____
- (8-9) _____ TEACHING (Area of Specialization) (13) IS YOUR POSITION THE KIND YOU HOPED TO OBTAIN?
 1. Elementary Education
 2. Art
 3. Biology
 4. Chemistry
 5. Commercial
 6. English
 7. French
 8. General Science
 9. German
 10. Industrial Education
 11. Latin
 12. Library Science
 13. Mathematics
 14. Music
 15. Physical Education - Men
 16. Physical Education - Women
 17. Physics
 18. Social Studies
 19. Spanish
 20. Special Education
 21. Speech
 22. Speech Correction
 23. Vocational Home Economics
 24. Other, please specify
 (14) IF "NO" STATE THE PRIMARY REASON IT FAILED TO MEET YOUR ASPIRATIONS
 1. Undesirable location
 2. Salary too low
 3. Too many preparations
 4. Poor teaching conditions
 5. Too many extra assignments
 6. Other, specify _____
- (15-19) PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PRESENT SALARY FOR FULL YEAR
- (20) DO YOU HAVE EMPLOYMENT IN ADDITION TO YOUR TEACHING JOB?
 1. Yes
 2. No

Hopkins

- (21) _____ IF YES, HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DO YOU WORK OTHER THAN TEACHING? (23) _____ WHAT ARE YOUR PLANS AS FAR AS TEACHING IS CONCERNED?
- WHAT TYPE WORK DO YOU DO OTHER THAN TEACHING?
- (22) _____ WHAT IS YOUR REACTION TO TEACHING? (24) _____ PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR.
- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| 1. Like it very much | 1. Intend to continue |
| 2. Well satisfied | 2. Plan to drop out |
| 3. Satisfied | 3. Am undecided at present |
| 4. Just tolerate it | 4. Plan to drop out for time being |
| 5. Dislike it | |
| | 1. Will teach again at present location |
| | 2. Expect to go back to college |
| | 3. Plan to enter another type of work |
| | 4. Plan not to work |

SECTION III.

NOTE: Please grade each of the possible responses just as you were graded as an undergraduate student at the University of Missouri.

In A102 Educational Psychology, what level of understanding did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| (25) _____ The concept of intelligence and measuring ability | F | D | C | B | A |
| (26) _____ How students are motivated | F | D | C | B | A |
| (27) _____ How students learn | F | D | C | B | A |
| (28) _____ Using statistics and measurement in the classroom | F | D | C | B | A |

In D140 School Organization and Administration For Secondary Teachers, what level of understanding did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (29) _____ The roles of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies in education. | F | D | C | B | A |
| (30) _____ Professional relationships and responsibilities of the classroom teacher. | F | D | C | B | A |
| (31) _____ The teacher's responsibility outside assigned classroom duties | F | D | C | B | A |
| (32) _____ Developments in secondary education | F | D | C | B | A |

In E140, School Organization and Administration for Elementary Teachers, what level of understanding did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (33) _____ The roles of federal, state, and local governmental agencies in education. | F | D | C | B | A |
| (34) _____ The organization of schools for instructional purposes | F | D | C | B | A |
| (35) _____ Classroom Management and Control | F | D | C | B | A |
| (36) _____ Measurement and Evaluation of Pupil Progress | F | D | C | B | A |
| (37) _____ Professional Status, Obligations and Responsibilities of Teachers | F | D | C | B | A |

Hopkins

In D111, Teaching of English in Secondary Schools, what level of proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (38) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (39) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (40) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (41) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (42) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (43) | ___ Adapting learning activities to English | F | D | C | B | A |

In D121, Teaching of Social Studies in Secondary Schools, what level of proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| (44) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (45) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (46) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (47) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (48) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (49) | ___ Adapting learning activities to Social Studies | F | D | C | B | A |

In D124, Teaching of Science in Secondary Schools, what level of proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (50) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (51) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (52) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (53) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (54) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (55) | ___ Adapting learning activities to science | F | D | C | B | A |

In D128, Teaching of Math in Secondary Schools, what level of proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (56) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (57) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (58) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (59) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (60) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (61) | ___ Adapting learning activities to math | F | D | C | B | A |

In D199, Student teaching in the Secondary Schools, what level of proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (62) | ___ Understanding of requirements of, and obligations to, the school in which I was teaching. | F | D | C | B | A |
| (63) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (64) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (65) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (66) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (67) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (68) | ___ Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area | F | D | C | B | A |

In E199, Student Teaching in the Elementary Schools, what level of proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| (69) | ___ Understanding of requirements of, and obligations to, the school in which I was teaching | F | D | C | B | A |
| (70) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (71) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (72) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (73) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (74) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (75) | ___ Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area | F | D | C | B | A |

Hopkins

(Duplicate Columns 1-4)

In E167, Mathematics in the Elementary School, what level of proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| (5) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (6) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (7) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (8) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (9) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (10) | ___ Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area | F | D | C | B | A |

In E198, Science in the Elementary School, what level of proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| (11) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (12) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (13) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (14) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (15) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (16) | ___ Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area | F | D | C | B | A |

In E325, Teaching Reading in the Elementary School, what level of proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| (17) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (18) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (19) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (20) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (21) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (22) | ___ Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area | F | D | C | B | A |

In E368, Social Studies in the Elementary School, what proficiency did you develop in the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| (23) | ___ Preparing unit and daily lesson plans | F | D | C | B | A |
| (24) | ___ Adjusting content to individual differences | F | D | C | B | A |
| (25) | ___ Evaluation of student learning | F | D | C | B | A |
| (26) | ___ Classroom management | F | D | C | B | A |
| (27) | ___ Use of instructional materials & media | F | D | C | B | A |
| (28) | ___ Adapting learning activities to my subject matter area | F | D | C | B | A |

What are your general feelings concerning your training as a teacher in the following areas:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| (29) | ___ Developed an understanding of how students learn | F | D | C | B | A |
| (30) | ___ Developed an understanding of the teacher's role in the classroom | F | D | C | B | A |
| (31) | ___ Developed an understanding of the school's administrative structure | F | D | C | B | A |
| (32) | ___ Developed a knowledge of teacher's professional organizations | F | D | C | B | A |
| (33) | ___ Developed the knowledge and skills to handle new innovative practices in education | F | D | C | B | A |
| (34) | ___ Developed the knowledge and skills to be a good teacher | F | D | C | B | A |
| (35) | ___ Developed an appreciation of Missouri's teacher education program | F | D | C | B | A |